

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS


Claims 1 through 5 and 8 through 15 are pending in this application. Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Bousfield (U.S. Patent No. 6,210,013); rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bousfield in view of Ciupke (U.S. Patent No. 5,461,547); rejects claims 5, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bousfield in view of Liao (U.S. Patent No. 6,789,923); and rejects claims 8, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bousfield in view of Dasher (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,599) . These rejections are moot as to claims 6 and 7, which have been cancelled.

The Office Action asserts that claims 7 and 10 through 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form. In order to advance the prosecution, applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of claim 7, as well as the intervening claim 6. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Bousfield. Claims 2 through 5 and 8 through 15 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are also not anticipated, nor obvious, over the cited art described above.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully urges that the rejections and objection be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that this application be passed to allowance.

Sincerely,



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero
& Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
telephone (203) 327-4500
fax (203) 327-6401

2-3-05

Date